



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,892	09/14/2006	Martin Riddiford	167/US	1778
30/593	7/5/0	08/04/2009		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195				
EXAMINER				
MANCHO, RONNIE M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3664				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/04/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/598,892

**Applicant(s)**

RIDDIFORD, MARTIN

**Examiner**

RONNIE MANCHO

**Art Unit**

3664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1- 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer Larry et al (WO 01/29514 A1) in view of Kalis et al (US 6966533).

Regarding claim 1, Spencer et al disclose a GPS navigation system comprising a dock 24 (figs. 1&4; page 3, lines 8-10) in combination with a portable GPS navigation device 26 (figs. 1, 2&4; page 5, lines 7-13; page 7, lines 6-19), in which the device is programmable with map data (*database of roads is interpreted as map data, page 4, lines 10-13*) and a navigation application that enables a route to be planned between two user-defined places, wherein the dock 24 comprises:

a RF connector 38 (fig. 1 and 2; page 4, lines 2-4) designed to automatically interface with a RF connector 40 (figs. 1 and 2; page 4, lines 2-4) in the device 26 in order to feed RF signals from an external aerial 48 to the device 26 when the device 26 is correctly mounted on the dock 24 (page 4, lines 2-9).

Spencer did not disclose a suction mount for mounting the dock. Although Spencer disclose a dock in a vehicle, Spencer did not disclose how the dock is mounted in a vehicle. However, Kalis (figs. 1&9; col. 6, lines 59-67) teaches of a suction mount (126, 134, fig. 9) that

enables a dock (20, 122, 124; fig. 9, col. 6, line 36+) to be removably connected to a portion of a vehicle (car windscreen col. 6, lines 65-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the electronic unit mounting art at the time the invention was made to modify Spencer as taught by Kalis (col. 1, lines 57+) for the purpose of providing a navigation system is compact, easily mounted and easily viewed.

Regarding claim 2, Spencer et al disclose the GPS navigation system of Claim 1 wherein the RF signals are GPS signals (page 4, lines 2-9).

Regarding claim 3, Spencer et al disclose the GPS navigation system of Claim 2 in which the dock 24 comprise a platform, wherein the device 26 is removably attached to the docking platform 24 (page 4, lines 2-9). Spencer did not disclose that the docking platform rotatably mounted. However, Kalis teaches of a dock (20, 122, 124) that comprises a platform that is rotatably mounted on an arm (*the arm is the section joining 126 to 124 through pivot F in fig. 9; col. 6, lines 50-64*), and a GPS device 12 (fig. 1) that is removably attached to the docking platform (20, 122, 124).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the electronic unit mounting art at the time the invention was made to modify Spencer as taught by Kalis (col. 1, lines 57+) for the purpose of providing a navigation system is compact, easily mounted and easily viewed.

Regarding claim 4, Spencer et al in view of Kalis disclose the GPS navigation system of Claim 3 in which the arm is pivotally mounted so that the platform (20, 122, 124; see Kalis fig.

9) can be moved vertically and horizontally (*the arm is the section joining 126 to 124 through pivot F in fig. 9; see Kalis col. 6, lines 50-64*).

Regarding claim 5, Spencer et al disclose the GPS navigation system of claim 1, but did not disclose a lip about which the device 26 is designed to rotate. However, Kalis (figs. 1 and 9; col. 3, lines 35-39; col. 6, lines 50-64) teaches of a navigation device comprising a lip 124 (fig. 9 of Kalis) about which a device 12 is designed to rotate when being mounted onto a dock (20, 122, 124, fig. 9), the lip 142 being shaped to guide the device 12 into correct alignment and engagement with the dock (20, 122, 124).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the electronic unit mounting art at the time the invention was made to modify Spencer as taught by Kalis (col. 1, lines 57+) for the purpose of providing a navigation system is compact, easily mounted and easily viewed.

Regarding claim 6, Spencer et al disclose the GPS navigation system of Claim 1, but did not disclose that it was mounted on a windshield. However, Kalis (col. 3, lines 23-35; col. 6, lines 65 and 66) teaches of a GPS device 12 mounted on a vehicle dashboard or windscreen.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the electronic unit mounting art at the time the invention was made to modify Spencer as taught by Kalis (col. 1, lines 57+) for the purpose of providing a navigation system is compact, easily mounted and easily viewed.

Regarding claim 7, Spencer Larry et al (WO 01/29514 A1) in view of Kalis et al (US 6966533) disclose the GPS navigation system of claim 1, wherein the dock further comprises:

an internal antenna, the internal antenna being connected to the portable GPS navigation device when the portable GPS navigation device is correctly mounted on the dock.

Claims 8- 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer Larry et al (WO 01/29514 A1) in view of Kalis et al (US 6966533) for having similar limitations as claims 1-7.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 4/15/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Applicant argues that the prior art does not disclose an "RF connector.....to feed RF signals...", but that the prior art discloses a wire. The argument is not convincing since applicant does not provide a definition of an RF connector or connection. It is believed that the prior art anticipates the limitations since an RF connector is also made out of wires to connect GPS signals. Are not GPS signals RF???

Applicant further argues that the combination of prior art is not proper. The argument is not convincing. Spencer did not disclose a suction mount for mounting the dock. Although Spencer disclose a dock in a vehicle, Spencer did not disclose how the dock is mounted in a vehicle. However, Kalis (figs. 1&9; col. 6, lines 59-67) teaches of a suction mount (126, 134, fig. 9) that enables a dock (20, 122, 124; fig. 9, col. 6, line 36+) to be removably connected to a portion of a vehicle (car windscreen col. 6, lines 65-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the electronic unit mounting art at the time the invention was made to modify Spencer as taught by Kalis (col. 1,

lines 57+) for the purpose of providing a navigation system is compact, easily mounted and easily viewed.

It is believed that the rejection is proper and shall stand.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Communication***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RONNIE MANCHO whose telephone number is (571)272-6984. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs: 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Khoi can be reached on 571-272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ronnie Mancho  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3664

/Dalena Tran/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3664

8/3/2009